L13.2:In2

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
W. N. DOAK, Secretary

WOMEN'S BUREAU
MARY ANDERSON, Directo

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA LIBRARIES
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
1969

WOMEN'S PLACE IN INDUSTRY IN 10 SOUTHERN STATES

BY
MARY ANDERSON

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1931

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - - - Price 5 cents

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	v
Industrial development	1
Southern women early makers of textile products	1
Early manufacturing in the South	2
Manufacturing vies with agriculture	2
Occupational distribution	3
As recorded in census of 1850	3
Growth of cotton mills, 1860 to 1885	3
Men and women employed in 1870 and 1920	4
Occupations of women in 1890 and 1920	4
Agriculture	4
Domestic and personal service	5
All manufacturing industries	5
Increase in certain manufacturing industries, 1880 to 1920	5
Women in manufacturing, 1920	5
Wages	6
Labor legislation	7
Factory inspection	7
Hours of work	8
Night work	8
Other labor legislation	8
Conclusion	9

APPENDIX—TABLES

TABLE I.	Number of gainfully-occupied persons and per cent they formed of total population 10 years of age and over, 1870 and 1920, by sex and State	10
II.	Number of gainfully-occupied women and proportion of these in certain occupational groups, 1890 and 1920, by State	10
III.	Number of women in manufacturing and proportion of these in chief industries, 1920, by State	11
IV.	Number of women in manufacturing and proportion of these in textile, tobacco, and certain clothing industries, 1880 and 1920, by State	11
V.	Legal limitation of working hours for women, by State	12

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
WOMEN'S BUREAU,
Washington, March 23, 1931.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith an address on the place of women in industry in 10 Southern States, delivered by me before the National Women's Trade Union League, in session at Greensboro, N. C., on March 7 of this year. It traces the occupational position of women in the 10 States up to 1920, and shows something of the economic background of southern life.

Respectfully submitted.

MARY ANDERSON, *Director.*

Hon. W. N. DOAK,
Secretary of Labor.

WOMEN'S PLACE IN INDUSTRY IN 10 SOUTHERN STATES

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

To one who has witnessed the characteristic development of a number of growing industrial communities and has followed the progress of the workers in their efforts toward better working conditions, reasonable hours, and fair pay, the development now taking place in many parts of the South is seen to have elements in common with the typical process that comes with industry, whether it be in England, in New England, in the South, or elsewhere.

The industrial awakening of a community brings with it the increased establishment of mills and factories, the growth of machinery, the appeal to prosperity, and the inducements to capital to locate.

This is the growth that now grips the South, with its broad fields, its great resources, its capital, its fine manhood and womanhood; yet in every such development are found certain characteristics that are individual and that apply particularly to the locality. Among these characteristics two appear outstanding in the South: First, the years of preoccupation with two great crops—cotton and tobacco—followed by a manufacturing system that concentrated largely on cotton and was not greatly diversified; and second, the unique background formed by the whole economic history of the area, a background difficult to understand without actual first-hand knowledge of its broad plantations, its thousands of small landowners and its tenant farmers. From such a background, in which cotton and tobacco were the dominant crops, in which the population was heterogeneous, in which the natural individualism of an agricultural area was enhanced by the particular aloofness of plantation ownership, and in which it had been the custom for plantation owners to assume personal responsibility for their employees, has grown the southern mill village, with its company houses and mill-welfare work and its lack of diversified industrial opportunity.

Southern women early makers of textile products.

Modern industrialism of the type associated with large-scale enterprise is developing somewhat later in the South than in certain other parts of the country, and it is significant to note that this growth shows great differences in various Southern States. However, after the War of the Revolution and in the early days of the nineteenth century, the South became well advanced in the growth of the small neighborhood shops that appeared in all parts of the country during that period.

Here, as in other parts of the world, women took up their traditional work, the manufacture of clothing materials and clothing

itself—the early textile industry. Sometimes a plantation having water power would undertake the initial processes of manufacture and send the weaving to be done in the simple farm homes that represented the great bulk of the white people, many of whom were Scotch-Irish, German, Moravian, Huguenot, or Swiss settlers who had learned the art of weaving in the old country. Practically every farmhouse had its spinning wheel and one or more looms on which the women spun yarn and wove cloth for the family wardrobe, and their work went in great measure—how great we can not tell—to make up the records of southern production along these lines.

Early manufacturing in the South.

The application of machinery to the manufacture of textile products began very early in the South. Before Slater erected the first Arkwright mill in Rhode Island, power and automatic machinery were applied to cotton spinning in South Carolina. In 1790, a small band of English weavers and spinners established in the tidewater region of the State an 84-spindle mill for the manufacture of fine cloths. Before 1800, spinning jennies and water-driven spinning frames were to be found in two South Carolina towns, and carding and spinning machinery was in use in eastern Tennessee. Early in the century, three Rhode Island manufacturers erected in South Carolina a mill of 700 spindles—the first to be built in the Piedmont region—hauling their machinery 250 miles over rough roads into the interior.

In 1810, the value of textiles produced was greater in North Carolina than in Massachusetts, and the census for that year records more homespun cotton manufactured in Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia than in the other 13 States and Territories combined, also more flax spun in Virginia than in any other State. We can not ascertain the full degree in which women contributed to this, but it is safe to say that the part they played was a large one.

Besides textile products and clothing of various kinds, furniture was made by local cabinetmakers, much of it good in line and finish, and farm wagons and fine carriages also were built in the South. By 1810 or 1820 there were thousands of small shops throughout the Southern States. To be sure, they did work that was quite local in character and much of the product was consumed at home or in the neighborhood, but the same could be said of other parts of the country. At that time there was every prospect that the South would become a diversified manufacturing section.

Manufacturing vies with agriculture.

Throughout the early years of the century, up to 1840, the rising manufactures vied with agriculture for development. But the industrial revolution in England, demanding large quantities of cotton for the use of its machines, and the invention of the gin, together with the then existing labor conditions, enabling the southern planter to prepare cotton quickly for export, made the receipt of profits more certain and more rapid from the growth of this commodity than from its manufacture into a finished product.

A very large factor in the promotion of agriculture was the favorable climate and the fertile soil found throughout large areas in the

Southern States. The thousands of small farmers who owned some land but did their own work found cotton or tobacco the most profitable crop, and these aspired to plantation ownership, which was also the ambition of men engaged in business, many of whom already were plantation proprietors. The development of a 1-crop or a 2-crop agriculture triumphed over that of manufacturing, and the ideal of plantation life considerably retarded urban growth.

The point at which manufacturing seems first to have lagged was between 1840 and 1850, according to census figures of number of persons employed in establishments whose product amounted to over $500 in the year. In every State there was a considerable increase in such manufacturing employment from 1820 to 1840, but in the next 10 years the numbers so employed showed a notable decline in 7 of the 10 Southern States under consideration; that is, the group bounded by Mason and Dixon's line and the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, omitting only West Virginia. Only in Georgia, Kentucky, and Maryland of this southern group was the increase in persons employed in manufacturing continuous to 1850. This decline after 1840 was not confined to the South but occurred in 8 of the 19 other States in which comparison could be made.

Of the free and slave population with occupations reported in 1840, over 16 per cent in the entire United States were in manufacturing, but in four of the Southern States—South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi—fewer than 5 per cent were so employed, and only in Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky was the per cent as much as 10.

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

As recorded in census of 1850.

By 1850 women came definitely into the recognized occupational figures of the Nation, for a record is obtainable of the "hands employed" in that year in "Manufactures, mining, and the mechanic arts." In the country as a whole (there were 31 States at that time) women formed nearly one-fourth of the "hands employed," but only in Georgia and Maryland among the Southern States did they approximate the proportion found in these industries nationally. In Alabama, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, where more than half the women in manufactures, mining, and the mechanic arts were in cotton manufactures, women formed over one-tenth of the total number of "hands," but in the remaining 3 States under consideration—Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee—they constituted 8 per cent or fewer of the total.

Growth of cotton mills, 1860 to 1885.

In 1860 there were about 160 cotton mills in the South. Ten years later many of these had been destroyed in the war or had deteriorated beyond repair by being run to capacity to furnish supplies. In 1880, usually considered as the date of the beginning of the modern industrial development in the South, there were the same number of mills as in 1860, but about twice as many spindles, and the number of spindles again was doubled between 1880 and 1885.

50344°—31——2

Men and women employed in 1870 and 1920.[1]

Figures from the decennial censuses of 1870 to 1920, as far as these are comparable, have been considered for the group of 10 Southern States in question—from Maryland and Kentucky on the north to Mississippi and Tennessee on the west.

In 1870 in these 10 States together a larger proportion of the women 10 years of age and over were gainfully employed than was the case in the United States as a whole. No doubt this was due largely to the employment of negro women in the South, but it is not possible to gauge the full extent of this, since the census does not separate figures by race as far back as 1870 in such a way that occupations in all States can be compared.

By 1920 the increase over 1870 in proportion of women employed had been somewhat greater in the whole country than in these 10 Southern States together, and in both cases something over 2 in 10 of the women 10 years of age or more were reported as gainfully occupied. In all the southern group but Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia the proportion was somewhat greater than in the country as a whole.

In 1920 from 7 to 8 of every 10 men were gainfully employed, both in the United States and in the 10 Southern States together. In the United States the increase over 1870 in proportion employed had been more than twice as great for women as for men, and in the 10 Southern States the proportion of men employed had declined slightly.

Separate consideration of the States shows the proportion of employed women to have increased from 1870 to 1920 in every State but Mississippi, the advance being greatest in Maryland, Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The proportion of men employed had declined in six States; it had increased slightly in Florida, Maryland, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The census figures on occupational distribution in 1930 are not yet available, and probably it will be several months before they can be put into form for adequate comparison with earlier figures.

Occupations of women in 1890 and 1920.

Three great occupational groups—agriculture, manufacturing, and domestic and personal service—engaged about four in every five of the gainfully-employed women in the group of 10 Southern States in 1920. In the country as a whole only three in every five were in these pursuits, the largest remaining groups being in the professions and in clerical service. That individual differences exist in the States of the South is strikingly illustrated by the occupational distribution.

Agriculture.—In 1920, in Alabama, South Carolina, and Mississippi from 58 to 68 per cent of the women were agricultural workers, although in the 10 States together less than 39 per cent and in the United States as a whole less than 13 per cent were so employed. The 30 years from 1890 to 1920 had reduced the proportion of women in agriculture in the case of the United States as a whole, the southern area under consideration, and each Southern State

[1] All occupation figures are based on the census classification "Females 10 years of age and over."

with the exception of Georgia and Kentucky, which showed very slight increases.

Domestic and personal service.—Both in the United States and in the South, domestic and personal service engaged over one in four of the women gainfully employed in 1920. While the proportion was only slightly higher in the 10 Southern States than in the United States, in 5 of them it rose well above the proportion for the whole country, ranging from about 30 per cent in Georgia to more than 46 per cent in Florida.

In every case but that of Florida, the proportion in domestic and personal service had declined from 1890 to 1920. This decrease, which in most cases was spectacular, was greater in the United States as a whole than in the 10 Southern States together.

All manufacturing industries.—In 1920, in the 10 Southern States about 1⅓ in every 10 employed women were in manufacturing, while in the country as a whole about 2¼ in 10 were so employed. Here again rather extreme variations among the Southern States are noticeable. Only in Maryland and North Carolina did the proportions of women engaged in manufacturing run as high as in the United States, while in 5 of the States the proportions of women so employed were smaller than that for the 10 States together. As compared with 1890, the proportion of women in manufacturing had risen in all but 1 of the 10 Southern States, though it had declined in the United States as a whole.

Increase in certain manufacturing industries, 1880 to 1920.

The increase in woman employment in certain manufacturing industries in the South, as compared with that in the United States as a whole, has been marked. The proportion in textile mills of all the women in manufacturing in the United States in 1920 showed a slight decline from the 1880 figure, and the proportions in tobacco and certain clothing industries showed increases of only about three points each.

In 3 of the 10 Southern States, the proportion in textile mills had declined in the 40-year period, but it had more than doubled in South Carolina and Tennessee and had largely increased in the other States. In Kentucky the proportion in tobacco factories had increased more than ten times in the 40 years, and in 4 other States the increases had been striking. The proportion in certain clothing industries had increased more than five times in 4 of the States under consideration, and it had doubled or more than doubled in 4 others.

Women in manufacturing, 1920.

A bird's-eye view of the distribution of women in manufacturing industries in the 10 Southern States in 1920 again reveals considerable variation among the States, and gives decided indication of tendencies toward diversification.

While in 6 of the States the textile industry employed much the largest proportions of the women in manufacturing, the 10 States together employed fewer than one-fifth of the women in textile mills in the entire country. In Florida, Kentucky, and Virginia the largest groups of women were in cigar and tobacco factories, and the 10

States employed more than one-third of the women so engaged in the United States.

The 10 States employed about one-tenth of the women in the whole country who were in certain clothing industries, such as cloak, suit, and dress manufacturing and the making of shirts and overalls. These included over one-third of the women in manufacturing in Maryland and nearly one-fifth of those in Kentucky, but fewer than one-tenth of those in each of the other States.

The 10 States employed, roughly, 1 in 6 of the women in the country who were in lumber and furniture factories, 1 in 9 of those in certain food industries, and 1 in 14 of those in printing and publishing. Lumber and furniture showed an unusual geographic distribution, every State having a group of women so employed, but the numbers ranging only from 217 to 752. In Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland from 400 to 600 women were in printing and publishing. The State of Mississippi, on the other hand, had only 26 women so reported.

The food industries had a greater relative importance in Mississippi and Maryland than in the other States. In Maryland a considerable group of women—4.8 per cent—were in metal work, and in Kentucky practically 3 per cent were in shoe factories.

WAGES

The ever-present problem of wages is especially apparent in the South. Prominent among the reasons for the low wage paid women in this section are two historical factors, which I will discuss briefly.

In the first place, until very recently, values have been affected by the standards of an agricultural civilization, and they still are so affected to a large extent. When the tenant farmer who, with the help of his wife and children, raises crops on shares, raises his own vegetables and cures his own meat, pays his rent with his labor, and frequently does not handle over $200 or $250 in money in the year—and the number of such tenant farmers in the South is legion, as recent studies in certain States have shown [2]—when such a farmer hears of a young girl earning $10 or $12 a week tending a loom and the rest of the family earning in proportion, it sounds like a measure of wealth. But if he transplants his family to the mill town he soon realizes how its financial needs expand when most of the food and clothing must be bought, and how small are the wages in relation to the need.

The second historical factor that has set a low-wage standard for women in the South has been the dominance in manufacturing of textiles, an industry that has been followed by a low-wage standard whatever the locality in which it has developed. In a study of the wages of over 100,000 women in many industries in 13 States, the Women's Bureau found wages universally low in cotton mills. The low wage for women in textiles may be considered a direct result of the low money value usually attached to the services of the woman

[2] A recent study in North Carolina stated that there were 63,487 white tenant farmers in that State, with their families numbering 317,500, or nearly one-fifth of the entire white population.—Dickey, J. A., and Branson, E. C., How Farm Tenants Live. University of North Carolina.

in the home. There she spun and wove, in the early days, without money payment. When she went to spin and weave in the factory, her employer and she herself set a low money value on her work.

The State studies made by the Women's Bureau in periods of fairly normal business activity include three large cotton-manufacturing States in the South—Mississippi, Georgia, and Tennessee. In the first named, 1 in 4 of the full-time women workers in cotton mills earned less than $8 a week, and in Georgia and Tennessee about 1 in 6 or 7 earned less than $10. Even the larger of these is less than a living wage for a woman in the South, and the situation becomes still more serious when it is found that earnings of women in cotton mills in these States showed a tendency to decline for women over 40 years of age.

Moreover, earnings of women in cotton factories have shown a marked decline in recent years. Pay-roll data published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for the period from 1924 to 1928 showed declines during that time of from 0.4 to 16.6 per cent in earnings in Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, and a slight advance—4.5 per cent—only in Alabama. The earnings of more than 10,000 women spinners and of more than 8,000 women weavers in 11 cotton-manufacturing States in the whole country, as reported in the same study, showed a decline of over 12 per cent.

A low wage for women not only necessitates a low standard of living for the women and their families but the evidence is conclusive, according to some of the most noted economists, that such a low wage paid one group tends to depress the wages of all workers, and thus to perpetuate a low living standard. Further, the effect upon industry is disastrous, since the low purchasing power of the workers—and wage earners constitute about three-fourths of the buying population—forms a continuous constricting influence upon the markets that industry otherwise might obtain for its goods.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Legislation for securing sound work conditions is likely to proceed slowly in newly developing industrial communities. In the South the individualism retained from the agricultural background has undoubtedly tended to retard such legislation. However, some progress has been made, and we hope the awakening that is now taking place among employers, workers, and the thinking men and women of the South will hasten the process in the near future..

Factory inspection.

The amounts spent for factory inspection are relatively small in most of the Southern States. In reporting on the costs to the various States of protection to person and property in 1928, the United States Department of Commerce shows that in the country as a whole factory inspection accounted for 2.9 per cent of the total spent for such protection. In the 10 Southern States under consideration, however, less than 1 per cent of the cost of protection to person and property was for factory inspection. Again the States vary, naturally. Half spend nothing for factory inspection,

and Tennessee exceeds the proportion averaged in the United States, the figure for that State being 3.5 per cent, exceeded by only seven States in the entire country.

Hours of work.

Two of the 10 States under consideration—Florida and Alabama—provide no protection against long hours. In surveys the Women's Bureau made of these two States more than one-tenth of the women covered in factories, stores, and laundries had schedules of 60 hours or longer in the week.

The South's earliest hour law for women that has remained on the statute books was enacted in Virginia in 1890. Alabama had an 8-hour law for women as early as 1887, but it was in effect only seven years. In the entire country, 10 States and the District of Columbia have 8-hour laws and 19 States have 8½-hour or 9-hour laws, but those in the South stand mostly in the 10-hour class, with Tennessee permitting 10½ hours, North Carolina 11 in manufacturing, and South Carolina 12 in stores. Of the eight Southern States having hour legislation, only three restrict weekly hours in any industry to less than 60: Tennessee has a 57-hour week, and South Carolina and Mississippi have set a maximum of 55 in certain manufacturing industries.

That such hours should not prevail, especially for women workers with their multitudinous home duties, is so obvious as hardly to need stating. Progress to-day, in many parts of the country and in many industries, is in the direction of the 40-hour 5-day week. The shorter workday means more general employment for everybody, more regular work for those employed, and increased time for the worker to make use of many products than can be consumed only in leisure hours. As an investment for national industrial prosperity it is not only fair but economically sound. Many statements could be quoted of employers who have tried the shorter workday and found it good business from the standpoint of elimination of waste and spoiled goods, reduction of absenteeism, reduction of accidents, and a more balanced production.

Night work.

The only State in this southern group that seeks to prevent the great physical and psychological dangers that have been proven over and over again to inhere in night work is South Carolina, where a law of 1911 set 10 p. m. as the latest closing time for women's work in stores. However, the far-seeing attitude of the textile manufacturers is now hastening the abolition of night work and will encourage the crystallization of this social advance into better legislation.

Other labor legislation.

Three of the 10 States—Alabama, Maryland, and Virginia—provide that women shall not be exposed to the hazards of mine work, and the States with no legislation on this subject have few women so employed. The provision of seats for workers is required in 9 of the 10 States, but in 3 of these—Maryland, South Carolina, and Alabama—such legislation is in effect only for some type of mercantile

establishment and does not apply to manufacturing (except in the city of Baltimore).

Such, in the main, is the brief tale of the legislation provided in the 10 States under consideration in the industrially developing South. While it is still too meager, it is perhaps as much as would have been found in other communities at the industrial stage now reached by the South, and the signs of southern awakening to the need of further measures give promise of better things to come.

CONCLUSION

As the historical process of industrialization develops, with aspects peculiar to the locality, certain hopeful tendencies are showing themselves. Here is a section that has far-seeing individuals who will profit by the history of such a growth as is taking place in the South and will avoid, by wise management and fairness to their workers, some of the more acute difficulties that may occur in other cases. There are mill owners and managers in the South who are showing wise judgment in the direction of improved wages, hours, and working conditions and the abolition of night work. Their success and their pride in such enterprises influence others toward improvement. The chamber of commerce of a leading Southern State, in a recent annual report, speaks as follows:

> * * * industrial development * * * must not be allowed to result in economic exploitation, lower social standards, business ethics, or public morals * * *.
>
> * * * labor must be given employment in * * * industrial plants amid conditions productive not only of adequate wages but conducive also of good health, happiness, and contentment.

With such pronouncements we can agree, and we can profess ourselves willing and glad to join hands with the aroused social forces of this southland toward a new day for her workers—a day that shall see in effect a living wage, reasonable hours of work, for the day and for the week, and the abolition of night work; in short, the assurance of time for leisure and opportunity for a healthier and a happier life.

APPENDIX—TABLES

TABLE I.—*Number of gainfully-occupied persons and per cent they formed of total population 10 years of age and over, 1870 and 1920, by sex and State*

State	Number of persons 10 years of age and over who were gainfully occupied				Per cent that gainfully-occupied persons formed of total population 10 years of age and over [1]			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	1870	1920	1870	1920	1870	1920	1870	1920
United States	10,669,635	33,064,737	1,836,288	8,549,511	74.8	78.2	13.1	21.1
Alabama	275,640	684,348	89,618	223,868	80.8	79.5	24.5	25.8
Florida	50,877	300,050	9,826	85,262	77.5	77.7	15.0	23.3
Georgia	329,185	840,412	115,493	288,745	82.0	78.6	26.6	26.7
Kentucky	364,300	719,629	50,293	131,493	78.0	77.1	10.9	14.5
Maryland	213,691	466,257	44,852	137,221	76.0	80.0	15.2	23.8
Mississippi	232,349	526,446	86,501	194,964	80.6	78.7	29.5	29.1
North Carolina	292,439	693,155	58,860	202,697	80.0	75.5	14.6	21.9
South Carolina	182,355	468,601	80,946	205,656	75.5	77.6	30.9	33.4
Tennessee	322,585	677,988	45,402	152,103	74.0	76.5	10.0	17.2
Virginia	337,464	677,366	75,201	156,210	78.9	76.4	16.3	18.1
10 Southern States	2,600,885	6,054,252	656,992	1,778,224	78.5	77.7	18.3	22.9

[1] The smallest proportion of the woman population found gainfully occupied in any census year from 1870 to 1920 was in 1890 in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, in 1880 in Kentucky and Virginia, and in 1870 in the other States included and in the United States. The largest proportion was in 1910, and not in 1920, due mainly to the fact that the census in the later year was taken in January instead of in the spring, greatly reducing the numbers returned as in agricultural pursuits.

For men, the smallest proportion was in 1890, except in Maryland, South Carolina, and the United States, in each of which it was in 1870. The largest proportion was in 1910, except in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi, in each of which it was in 1880.

TABLE II.—*Number of gainfully-occupied women and proportion of these in certain occupational groups, 1890 and 1920, by State*

State	Number of gainfully-occupied women			Per cent of all women gainfully occupied who were in—									
				Agriculture		Manufacturing		Domestic and personal service		Clerical service		All other	
	1890	1920	Per cent increase	1890	1920	1890	1920	1890	1920	1890	1920	1890	1920
United States	3,914,571	8,549,511	118.4	17.3	12.7	26.2	22.6	41.2	25.6	3.1	16.7	12.2	22.5
Alabama	129,975	223,868	72.2	62.3	58.4	5.1	6.7	25.9	25.6	.3	3.5	6.4	9.3
Florida	26,423	85,262	222.7	37.0	17.6	9.5	12.8	42.4	46.4	.7	6.8	10.4	16.3
Georgia	159,923	288,745	80.6	44.1	44.7	7.6	10.0	40.2	29.8	.4	4.9	7.6	10.6
Kentucky	83,378	131,493	57.7	14.2	14.7	19.1	19.4	54.6	33.6	2.0	11.1	10.0	21.2
Maryland	84,752	137,221	61.9	3.2	2.3	28.3	26.4	54.9	35.4	1.7	15.7	11.8	20.3
Mississippi	124,808	194,964	56.2	71.6	68.0	2.6	3.1	19.8	18.7	.2	2.0	5.8	8.2
North Carolina	115,192	202,697	76.0	48.3	39.7	11.6	23.0	32.7	21.5	.2	3.9	7.1	11.9
South Carolina	129,431	205,656	58.9	68.3	61.7	6.6	10.2	19.0	18.6	.2	2.2	5.8	7.2
Tennessee	80,582	152,108	88.8	29.6	23.9	10.7	14.8	50.2	36.4	1.1	8.1	8.4	16.7
Virginia	106,366	156,210	46.9	15.7	11.9	13.5	18.2	60.7	41.1	.7	10.4	9.4	18.4
10 Southern States	1,040,830	1,778,224	70.8	43.2	38.5	10.3	13.6	37.8	28.9	.6	6.1	7.8	12.9

TABLE III.—*Number of women in manufacturing and proportion of these in chief industries, 1920, by State*

NUMBER

State	Number of women in all manufacturing industries [1]	Women in manufacturing who were in—					
		Textiles	Cigars and tobacco	Food industries	Certain clothing industries	Lumber and furniture	Printing and publishing
United States	1,930,341	471,332	97,822	93,140	267,472	29,379	43,672
Alabama	15,103	8,405	33	491	760	520	105
Florida	10,923	78	5,380	292	208	543	64
Georgia	28,970	15,136	248	1,366	2,012	685	306
Kentucky [2]	25,536	1,591	7,035	1,096	4,602	447	549
Maryland [3]	36,195	3,294	1,636	3,568	12,177	306	586
Mississippi	6,067	1,368		639	281	467	26
North Carolina	46,655	29,116	9,828	214	683	528	99
South Carolina	21,029	15,748	575	257	317	217	57
Tennessee	22,585	9,947	775	852	2,032	752	421
Virginia	28,371	4,703	9,657	1,851	2,673	599	531
10 Southern States [4]	241,434	89,386	35,167	10,626	25,745	5,064	2,744

PER CENT

United States	100.0	24.4	5.1	4.8	13.9	15.2	2.3
Alabama	100.0	55.7	.2	3.3	5.0	3.4	.7
Florida	100.0	.7	49.3	2.7	1.9	5.0	.6
Georgia	100.0	52.2	.9	4.7	6.9	2.4	1.1
Kentucky [2]	100.0	6.2	27.5	4.3	18.0	1.8	2.1
Maryland [3]	100.0	9.1	4.5	9.9	33.6	.8	1.6
Mississippi	100.0	22.5	(5)	10.5	4.6	7.7	.4
North Carolina	100.0	62.4	21.1	.5	1.5	1.1	.2
South Carolina	100.0	74.9	2.7	1.2	1.5	1.0	.3
Tennessee	100.0	44.0	3.4	3.8	9.0	3.3	1.9
Virginia	100.0	16.6	34.0	6.5	9.4	2.1	1.9
10 Southern States [4]	100.0	37.0	14.6	4.4	10.7	2.1	1.1

[1] In every State a large group of those not reported here were dressmakers, seamstresses, and milliners, not in factories.

[2] In Kentucky 740 women (2.9 per cent) were in shoe factories.

[3] In Maryland 1,742 women (4.8 per cent) were in metal industries.

[4] The proportion of all women so employed in the United States who were in the 10 Southern States was as follows:

	Per cent		Per cent
Textiles	19.0	Certain clothing industries	9.6
Cigars and tobacco	35.9	Lumber and furniture	17.2
Food industries	11.4	Printing and publishing	7.2

[5] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

TABLE IV.—*Number of women in manufacturing and proportion of these in textile, tobacco, and certain clothing industries, 1880 and 1920, by State*

State	Number of women in all manufacturing industries		Per cent of women in manufacturing who were in—					
			Textiles		Cigars and tobacco		Certain clothing industries	
	1880	1920	1880	1920	1880	1920	1880	1920
United States	631,215	1,930,341	25.3	24.4	1.7	5.1	10.7	13.9
Alabama	3,530	15,103	39.3	55.7	.4	.2	.7	5.0
Florida	629	10,923	1.6	.7	16.1	49.3	.3	1.9
Georgia	7,209	28,970	34.0	52.2	.1	.9	1.6	6.9
Kentucky	7,687	25,536	3.4	6.2	2.7	27.5	9.0	18.0
Maryland	14,711	36,195	14.5	9.1	1.8	4.5	16.0	33.6
Mississippi	1,789	6,067	29.6	22.5	.1	(1)	.4	4.6
North Carolina	5,528	46,655	37.7	62.4	8.8	21.1	2.0	1.5
South Carolina	3,811	21,029	36.4	74.9	(1)	2.7	1.0	1.5
Tennessee	3,636	22,585	21.4	44.0	.9	3.4	2.8	9.0
Virginia	8,449	28,371	10.4	16.6	31.8	34.0	1.8	9.4
10 Southern States	56,979	241,434	20.9	37.0	6.7	14.6	6.3	10.7

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

TABLE V.—*Legal limitation of working hours for women, by State*

State	Legal limit fixed for—		Establishments to which legal limit applies	Legal prohibition of night work
	Daily hours	Weekly hours		
Alabama [1]	None.	None.		None.
Florida	None.	None.		None.
Georgia	10	60	Men and women in cotton or woolen mills.[2] Excepts clerical force, cleaners, and specified occupations that employ chiefly men. May exceed daily but not weekly limit.	None.
Kentucky	10	60	Laundries, bakeries, factories, workshops, stores or mercantile, manufacturing, or mechanical establishments, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph.	None.
Maryland	10	60	Manufacturing, mechanical, mercantile, printing, baking, laundering establishments. Excepts fruit and vegetable canneries. Provides for certain emergencies in certain parts of the State.	None.
Mississippi	10	60	Women in enumerated list or "any other occupation not here enumerated." Excepts domestic service.	None.
	10	55	Men and women in mills, canneries, workshops, factories, or manufacturing establishments. Excepts fruit or vegetable canneries, and emergencies.	
North Carolina	11	60	Factories and manufacturing establishments. Same for men with some exceptions: Excepts office men and specified occupations that employ chiefly men.	None.
South Carolina	12	60	Women in mercantile establishments	Women in mercantile "not allowed" to work after 10 p. m.
	10	55	Men and women in cotton and woolen mills.[2] Specified overtime allowed for emergencies.	
Tennessee	10½	57	Enumerated list, or "any kind of establishment wherein labor is employed or machinery used." Excepts domestic service, fruit and vegetable canneries, and agricultural pursuits.	None.
Virginia	10	60	Factories, workshops, laundries, restaurants, mercantile or manufacturing establishments. Excepts clerical workers, fruit and vegetable canneries, stores in smaller towns.	None.

[1] Alabama was the first of the 10 States to pass hour legislation. The 8-hour law of 1887, applying to manufacturing and mechanical industries, was repealed in 1894.

[2] Of the women in manufacturing, industries other than textiles employ: In Georgia, at least 12,400 women, or over 40 per cent of all in manufacturing; in South Carolina, about 3,500 women, or more than 15 per cent of all in manufacturing.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU

[Any of these bulletins still available will be sent free of charge upon request]

*No. 1. Proposed Employment of Women During the War in the Industries of Niagara Falls, N. Y. 16 pp. 1918.
No. 2. Labor Laws for Women in Industry in Indiana. 29 pp. 1919.
No. 3. Standards for the Employment of Women in Industry. 8 pp. Fourth ed., 1928.
No. 4. Wages of Candy Makers in Philadelphia in 1919. 46 pp. 1919.
*No. 5. The Eight-Hour Day in Federal and State Legislation. 19 pp. 1919.
No. 6. The Employment of Women in Hazardous Industries in the United States. 8 pp. 1921.
No. 7. Night-Work Laws in the United States. (1919.) 4 pp. 1920.
*No. 8. Women in the Government Service. 37 pp. 1920.
*No. 9. Home Work in Bridgeport, Conn. 35 pp. 1920.
*No. 10. Hours and Conditions of Work for Women in Industry in Virginia. 32 pp. 1920.
No. 11. Women Street-Car Conductors and Ticket Agents. 90 pp. 1921.
*No. 12. The New Position of Women in American Industry. 158 pp. 1920.
No. 13. Industrial Opportunities and Training for Women and Girls. 48 pp. 1921.
*No. 14. A Physiological Basis for the Shorter Working Day for Women. 20 pp. 1921.
No. 15. Some Effects of Legislation Limiting Hours of Work for Women. 26 pp. 1921.
No. 16. (See Bulletin 63.)
No. 17. Women's Wages in Kansas. 104 pp. 1921.
No. 18. Health Problems of Women in Industry. 6 pp. Revised, 1931.
No. 19. Iowa Women in Industry. 73 pp. 1922.
*No. 20. Negro Women in Industry. 65 pp. 1922.
No. 21. Women in Rhode Island Industries. 73 pp. 1922.
*No. 22. Women in Georgia Industries. 89 pp. 1922.
No. 23. The Family Status of Breadwinning Women. 43 pp. 1922.
No. 24. Women in Maryland Industries. 96 pp. 1922.
No. 25. Women in the Candy Industry in Chicago and St. Louis. 72 pp. 1923.
No. 26. Women in Arkansas Industries. 86 pp. 1923.
No. 27. The Occupational Progress of Women. 37 pp. 1922.
No. 28. Women's Contributions in the Field of Invention. 51 pp. 1923.
No. 29. Women in Kentucky Industries. 114 pp. 1923.
No. 30. The Share of Wage-Earning Women in Family Support. 170 pp. 1923.
No. 31. What Industry Means to Women Workers. 10 pp. 1923.
No. 32. Women in South Carolina Industries. 128 pp. 1923.
No. 33. Proceedings of the Women's Industrial Conference. 190 pp. 1923.
No. 34. Women in Alabama Industries. 86 pp. 1924.
No. 35. Women in Missouri Industries. 127 pp. 1924.
No. 36. Radio Talks on Women in Industry. 34 pp. 1924.
No. 37. Women in New Jersey Industries. 99 pp. 1924.
No. 38. Married Women in Industry. 8 pp. 1924.
No. 39. Domestic Workers and Their Employment Relations. 87 pp. 1924.
No. 40. (See Bulletin 63.)
No. 41. Family Status of Breadwinning Women in Four Selected Cities. 145 pp. 1925.
No. 42. List of References on Minimum Wage for Women in the United States and Canada. 42 pp. 1925.
No. 43. Standard and Scheduled Hours of Work for Women in Industry. 68 pp. 1925.
No. 44. Women in Ohio Industries. 137 pp. 1925.
No. 45. Home Environment and Employment Opportunities of Women in Coal-mine Workers' Families. 61 pp. 1925.
No. 46. Facts about Working Women—A Graphic Presentation Based on Census Statistics. 64 pp. 1925.
No. 47. Women in the Fruit-Growing and Canning Industries in the State of Washington. 223 pp. 1926.

---

* Supply exhausted.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 08859 0434

*No. 48. Women in Oklahoma Industries. 118 pp. 1926.
No. 49. Women Workers and Family Support. 10 pp. 1925.
No. 50. Effects of Applied Research upon the Employment Opportunities of American Women. 54 pp. 1926.
No. 51. Women in Illinois Industries. 108 pp. 1926.
No. 52. Lost Time and Labor Turnover in Cotton Mills. 203 pp. 1926.
No. 53. The Status of Women in the Government Service in 1925. 103 pp. 1926.
No. 54. Changing Jobs. 12 pp. 1926.
No. 55. Women in Mississippi Industries. 89 pp. 1926.
No. 56. Women in Tennessee Industries. 120 pp. 1927.
No. 57. Women Workers and Industrial Poisons. 5 pp. 1926.
No. 58. Women in Delaware Industries. 156 pp. 1927.
No. 59. Short Talks About Working Women. 24 pp. 1927.
No. 60. Industrial Accidents to Women in New Jersey, Ohio, and Wisconsin. 316 pp. 1927.
No. 61. The Development of Minimum-Wage Laws in the United States, 1912 to 1927. 635 pp. 1928.
No. 62. Women's Employment in Vegetable Canneries in Delaware. 47 pp. 1927.
No. 63. State Laws Affecting Working Women. 51 pp. 1927. (Revision of Bulletins 16 and 40.)
No. 64. The Employment of Women at Night. 86 pp. 1928.
*No. 65. The Effects of Labor Legislation on the Employment Opportunities of Women. 498 pp. 1928.
No. 66. History of Labor Legislation for Women in Three States; Chronological Development of Labor Legislation for Women in the United States. 288 pp. 1929.
No. 67. Women Workers in Flint, Mich. 80 pp. 1929.
No. 68. Summary: The Effects of Labor Legislation on the Employment Opportunities of Women. (Reprint of Chapter 2 of Bulletin 65.) 22 pp. 1928.
No. 69. Causes of Absence for Men and for Women in Four Cotton Mills. 24 pp. 1929.
No. 70. Negro Women in Industry in 15 States. 74 pp. 1929.
No. 71. Selected References on the Health of Women in Industry. 8 pp. 1929.
No. 72. Conditions of Work in Spin Rooms. 41 pp. 1929.
No. 73. Variations in Employment Trends of Women and Men. 143 pp. 1930.
No. 74. The Immigrant Woman and Her Job. 179 pp. 1930.
No. 75. What the Wage-Earning Woman Contributes to Family Support. 20 pp. 1929.
No. 76. Women in 5-and-10-cent Stores and Limited-Price Chain Department Stores. 58 pp. 1930.
No. 77. A Study of Two Groups of Denver Married Women Applying for Jobs. 11 pp. 1929.
No. 78. A Survey of Laundries and Their Women Workers in 23 Cities. 166 pp. 1930.
No. 79. Industrial Home Work. 20 pp. 1930.
No. 80. Women in Florida Industries. 115 pp. 1930.
No. 81. Industrial Accidents to Men and Women. 48 pp. 1930.
No. 82. The Employment of Women in the Pineapple Canneries of Hawaii. 30 pp. 1930.
No. 83. Fluctuation of Employment in the Radio Industry. 66 pp. 1931.
No. 84. Fact Finding with the Women's Bureau. 37 pp. 1931.
No. 85. Wages of Women in 13 States. 211 pp. 1931.
No. 86. Activities of the Women's Bureau of the United States. 15 pp. 1931.
No. 87. Sanitary Drinking Facilities, with Special Reference to Drinking Fountains. 28 pp. 1931.
No. 88. The Employment of Women in Slaughtering and Meat Packing. (In press.)
No. 89. The Industrial Experience of Women Workers at the Summer Schools, 1928 to 1930. (In press.)
No. 90. Oregon Legislation for Women in Industry. (In press.)
Pamphlet. Women's Place in Industry in 10 Southern States. 14 pp. 1931.
Annual Reports of the Director, 1919*, 1920*, 1921*, 1922, 1923, 1924*, 1925, 1926, 1927*, 1928*, 1929, 1930, 1931.

* Supply exhausted.